

## **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### **Claim Status**

Claims 1, 3 and 5-18 are pending in this application. Claims 2 and 4 were previously canceled. Claims 1, 3, 5-11 and 13-18 have been rejected. Claim 12 has been objected to by the Examiner. Claims 5, 7 and 12 are herein canceled. Claims 1, 6, 16 and 17 are herein amended. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

### **Objections to the Specification**

The Examiner has objected to the specification by asserting that the sentence, “[t]he source of ... PMOS transistor Q13” on page 8, lines 12-13, should “be deleted because it is incorrect.” In particular, the Examiner indicated that “Fig. 3 does not show the (control) gate of Q13 being connected to the source of Q13.” Applicants have amended the above-mentioned portion of the specification to recite “[t]he source of the PMOS transistor Q13 is connected to ~~the~~ a back gate of the PMOS transistor Q13.” Reconsideration of this objection is respectfully requested.

### **Objections to the Claims**

The Examiner has objected to claims 1, 3 and 5. In particular, the Examiner indicated that “[t]o improve word flow, it is suggested that --a-- be added prior to ‘plurality’ on line 2 of claim 1.” Applicants have amended claim 1 as per the Examiner’s suggestion. Reconsideration of this objection is respectfully requested.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 17 and its dependent claim 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Examiner asserted that the limitation on lines 4-5 of claim 17 (i.e., a source of the PMOS transistor ... is connected to the gate of the PMOS transistor) is misleading and/or inaccurate.

Applicants have amended claim 17 to recite "... a voltage supply circuit having at least one PMOS transistor and a set of NMOS transistors, wherein ... a source of the PMOS transistor receives the externally applied voltage and is connected to ~~the~~ a back gate of the PMOS transistor ...", thus clarifying the limitation at issue. Reconsideration of the rejections to claims 17 and 18 is respectfully requested.

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 3 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,877,652 (Oh).

Applicants respectfully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claim 12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of its base claims and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants have essentially incorporated the features of claim 12 into independent claim 1 to place independent claim 1 and the claims which depend therefrom in condition for allowance.

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 6-11 and 13-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over PCT WO 01/61430 A1 (Viehmänn) in view of what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Claims 6-11 and 13-16 have been rejected

under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,838,188 (Taguchi) in view of what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicants respectfully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claim 12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of its base claims and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants have essentially incorporated the features of claim 12 into independent claims 6 and 16 to place independent claims 6 and 16 and the claims which depend therefrom in condition for allowance.


#### **Dependent Claims**

Applicants have not independently addressed the rejections of the dependent claims because Applicants submit that, in view of the amendments to the claims presented herein and, for at least similar reasons as why the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend are believed allowable as discussed, supra, the dependent claims are also allowable. Applicants however, reserve the right to address any individual rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary or appropriate.

### CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claims as herein presented are allowable over the prior art of record, taken alone or in combination, and that the respective rejections be withdrawn. Applicants further submit that the application is hereby placed in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Richard D. Ratchford Jr.  
Reg. No. 53,865  
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
130 Woodbury Rd.  
Woodbury, NY 11797  
Tel: (516) 692-8888  
FAX: (516) 692-8889